

# ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon the Doctrine of

## Transubstantiation.

A

## SERMON

PREACHED

Before the Right Honourable

THE

Lord Mayor

And the Court of ALDERMEN,

Octob. xix. 1679.

At the GUILD-HALL Chappel,

LONDON.

By JOHN TURNER, Fellow of Christs-Colledge in  
CAMBRIDGE.

Χαλεπὸν ἐκ τῶν μὴ καλῶς ἔχόντων λέγειν καλῶς.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishops-Head* in *S. Paul's*  
Church-Yard, 1679.

AND ADVERTISEMENTS

Transmittal

THE

OLD

COURT OF COMMONS

OF GREAT BRITAIN

LONDON

Printed 5/29/31 6/- (1931)

To the Right Honourable  
Sir JAMES EDWARDS, Kt.  
**Lord MAYOR**  
Of the CITY of  
**LONDON.**  
And to the Court of  
**ALDERMEN.**

Right Honourable,

**I** Have presumed in Obedience to the Com-  
mands of my Superiours, which are a  
Law to me, and ought to be so to every Honest  
man, to publish the following Discourse; in  
which adventure I am so far from having any o-  
ther Motive than that of perfect Submission to  
all the lawful injunctions of Authority, that if I  
had been only to consult mine own inclination,  
I think I should have deferred it till some far-  
ther

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

ther time; for otherwise I will not deny, but that I did design this and somewhat more upon this Subject should appear abroad, out of some hope which I have, that as the Subject its self which I have undertaken will be very seasonable and suitable to the present juncture of time, so also that what I have to suggest upon it may not be altogether unuseful or unacceptable to the World, or at least to that part of it, which has either the patience to hear Reason or the Justice to suffer themselves to be directed by it.

However it may be a certain Argument, that I have no other Design than that of Obedience to Your Lordship, and the Honourable Court, that what I have now exposed to the View of the Publick, is an Imperfect thing, as will sufficiently appear by the perusal of the Sermon its self, which leaves one of the particulars proposed in a great measure unconsidered, I mean, that Second Head of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which will contain these Two Particulars, First, of the Time, and Secondly of the Nature of that  
Last



## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*Last supper, which our Saviour Celebrated with his Disciples ; which being a Disquisition of a Philological nature, and so not altogether so proper for the Pulpit, I have the confidence to hope, that what I have performed upon This Occasion may seem the less defective for its want of that part.*

*Such as it is, I do here in most Humble manner Present it to Your Patronage and Protection, Hoping for Your kind and favourable Acceptance, And am,*

Right Honourable,

Your most Obedient Servant,

JOHN TURNER.

LONDON,  
October 27. 1679.



A  
S E R M O N

PREACHED

Before the Lord *MAYOR*.

1 Cor. chap. 5. vers. 7, 8.

*For even Christ our Pässeover is Sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the Feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of Sincerity and Truth.*

**F**ROM these words I design to speak some little of that great deal, which may be urged against the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; a doctrine which though weak and unable to support its self, yet it is of that consequence to the whole Fabrick of the *Romish* Church, that if this be but once thoroughly defeated and exposed, the other must of necessity fall together with it.

Wherefore as this Doctrine unable to maintain its self, upon any bottom or foundation of its own, flies for refuge to a vain pretence of an infallible Spirit, that is, of the Spirit of God; so if it be but once granted, that this Spirit cannot contradict its self, or act inconsistently

to its own declared revelations, and then solidly proved, that the revealed will of God in the Scriptures of the New Testament, do plainly and directly oppose and condemn this Doctrine, then is it manifest that the Catholick Church, as they call themselves, that is, the Bishop of Rome and his followers, are not only fallible, but actually deceived, in their main Article of Faith, and in one of the most eminent marks of distinction betwixt those of That and the Reformed Communion.

So that to overthrow this Doctrine by unquestionable strength of Reason, and by plain and undeniable testimony of Scripture, is in effect to do by the Religion of Rome, as she would have done by the persons of all that are not of the same grain and tincture with her self, to cut it off and utterly destroy it at a blow. Nor that we are to expect that Faction, or Prejudice, or Interest will ever be disputed out of an opinion; this perhaps will never wholly be brought to pass, so long as there are either diverse men, or diversity of Opinions and Interests in the World: but I say if men would act according to the true dictates of natural conscience and reason, then if it be acknowledged on both hands, that the Scriptures are infallible and divinely inspired; and if it be equally clear, that the truth of the Scriptures cannot possibly consist with that of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; then, if men will not give themselves over to all manner of Imposture and delusion, without measure and without end, they must of necessity disclaim that doctrine as an error, which is so far from being defended, that it is manifestly and strongly opposed by the confessedly infallible Authority of Scripture.

And because both parts of a contradiction cannot possibly be infallibly true, but the one must of necessity be infallibly true, the other infallibly false; there is nothing more plain, than that, if they acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, they must at the same time unavoidably renounce the pretended infallibility of the Church of Rome, and consequently the Church its self, the certainty of

of whose Faith and Doctrine is built upon this rotten and sandy foundation; and which by consequence may under this false, though specious pretence, lead us into innumerable errors and mistakes, and that in matters as well of Practice as Belief: for when things come to be thoroughly examined, it will be difficult to set bounds to this infallible Spirit, so as to draw a line where infallibility borders upon the possibilities of error, or upon downright mistake, and to say, thus far shalt thou go and no farther.

In the words therefore lately read to you, there are two things worthy of your special notice; First, *That Christ is our Passeeover*. Secondly, *that we are to keep the Feast in memory of this Passeeover*, as the Jewish Feast was a memorial of the Jewish Passeeover, with the unleavened bread of Sincerity and Truth. I. *Christ is our Passeeover*, that is, he is the same thing to all mankind, but in a more eminent and transcendent manner, which the Jewish Passeeover was to the Jews, only with this difference, that whereas the solemnity of the Passeeover among the Jews was to be repeated every year at the stated and usual time, that is to say, on the Fourteenth day of the first, or in some cases of the second Moneth, Christ who was typified by it, was to be but once offered to bear the sins of many, Heb. 9. 28. And we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, Heb. 10. 10.

Exod. 12.  
14.

See Numbr.  
9. 5. collat.  
cum v. 9.  
10. 8.  
2 Chro.  
30. 15.

Wherefore if the eating the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, and the drinking of his Bloud, which is the effusion of it, be a renewal of his Passion, a sacrificing of and a feeding upon the Passeeover afresh, then I affirm that no such thing is done, or at least we must be reduced to this Dilemma, Either the Scriptures are not true, or the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false. Now whether the determination of the Author to the Hebrews, that is, of an inspired writer, that is, in effect of God himself, and of S. Peter in his first Epistle, Chap. 3. ver. 18. where he tells us, that *Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust*; and a man would think, he was every whit

as infallible as any of his pretended successors; I say, which of these is most to be believed and stood to, judge ye; nay, let our Adversaries themselves be judges.

*Deut. 16.  
2, 5, 6, 7.*

Again, Christ being our Passeeover, was for this very reason among others offered up at *Jerusalem*, because it was unlawful to kill the Passeeover at any other place, after such time as the Temple was built.

*2 Chron.  
30. 2.  
2 Kings  
23. 23.  
Ezra 6. 19  
Luk. 2. 41.*

Thus those three great and solemn Passeeovers which we read of in the times of *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*, and *Ezra* were every one of them celebrated at *Jerusalem*; and it is said of *Joseph* and the blessed Virgin the Mother of our Lord, that they went to *Jerusalem* every year at the Feast of the Passeeover.

Now if Christ suffered at *Jerusalem*, because the Passeeover was to be killed there, if Christ be our Passeeover, and if the Passeeover could not be sacrificed any where else, nay, if it cannot now be offered at *Jerusalem* its self, because the City and Temple are demolished, because God hath taken his name from thence, because instead of being the *Metropolis* of true Religion, it is now the seat of the grossest Idolatry and Superstition, because the law of *Moses* is abolished, because the meaning and intencion of the Passeeover is completed; if all these things be true, as most certainly they are, then is it plain, that if Christ be corporally and substantially present in the Sacrament, if his Body and Bloud be truly and properly eaten and drunk by us, yet he is not present, neither do we feed upon him as our Passeeover.

Wherefore it is clear, that either Christ hath ceased to be our Passeeover, and then it will be more easie than pleasant to pronounce what will become of us, we are all in a very miserable condition; or else it is not lawful to feed upon him, since the Passeeover cannot now be eaten in any part of the world: and therefore we may assure our selves from this, (as well as from what has been said above that he could be offered up but once) that we neither do nor ought to feed upon him, if we will follow his

his own Institution; and why he should enable any Romish Priest to work a Miracle, such a strange Miracle as this of *Transubstantiation*, in contradiction both to the Law and Gospel, is a most Prodigiously strange and unaccountable thing. I am confident it will puzzle the Ablest person of Their Church to give a Tolerable account of this.

Lastly, Christ is our Passeeover, therefore it is unlawful to Drink his Bloud, for the bloud of the Passeeover as of other Sacrifices, could not by the Law of *Moses* be either Eaten or Drunk, therefore we may boldly affirm that the Priest when he pronounces those words, *This is my bloud*, or *This is my bloud of the New Testament*, does not by this means Transubstantiate the Wine into it, therefore neither is the Bread changed into the Body of Christ, by his saying *this is my body*; for the case is the same in both, and it is altogether incredible that such a wonderful power should accompany those words, *This is my Body*, when those other, *This is my Bloud*, which one would imagine in all reason, should be considered, by themselves, of equal force and validity with the former, have no such virtue or efficacy at all.

I take the confidence to affirm that all this is absolute, irresistible demonstration, if there be such a thing as Demonstration in the world; for Christ was not truly and literally a Paschal Lamb, no, he was a man born of a woman as we are, though after a more divine and heavenly manner, by the Overshadowing of the Holy Ghost in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin; but he is called our Passeeover, only in respect of the Likeness or Analogy, which there was betwixt his Sacrifice of himself upon the Cross, and the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb under the Law.

Now I beseech you, where is the Analogy, if these Paschal Lambs, whose bloud was first sprinkled in that great deliverance upon the Posts and Lintels of the *Israel* houses, could be but once Offered, and all succeeding Paschatizations, were nothing else but Thankful acknowledgements and commemorations of this, while all this  
while



while the same, the very self same Christ, may be offered every day in the Year, and every hour in the day, as often as ever we Receive the Sacrament, and as many times told, almost at the very same instant, as there are people that receive it?

Where is the Analogy, if the *Mosaical* Passcover could be Offered no where but at *Jerusalem*, and cannot be Offered so much as there any more, if one and the same Christ at the very same instant may be Offered in all parts of the world, and all this as many times repeated, as there are days and hours, nay, moments, the most incredibly small parts, the most exquisite subdivisions, and, as it were, Atoms of time, from the first Institution of the Sacrament to the end of the world?

Lastly, Where is the Analogy, if the Bloud of the Paschal Lamb were most strictly prohibited to be either Drunk or Eaten, and yet there is a necessity of drinking the Bloud of Christ? An Imputation which the Priest with all his Artifice and Sophistry cannot possibly avoid, and the people also are affirmed to do it Collectively, though they do not take the Elements in sunder: and certainly this, if it be not Eating and Drinking bloud, yet it is at least Eating with the bloud, which was as much unlawful as the other, and this was the sin of the *Israelites* in the 14<sup>th</sup>. Chapter of the first book of *Samuel*, which I have formerly cited in what I have said elsewhere upon this Subject.

So that it is manifest a man must have the impudence to contradict plain Texts of Scripture, as well as common sense, he must destroy the Analogy of Types to their Antitypes, of Symbols to their Substance, as well as the Agreement and Connection of things with one another, before he can assert the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, to be a True doctrine.

And I doubt it is not worth our while to go thus far about, this is more cost than worship; certainly 'tis a very hard bargain, for a man to relinquish common sense,



to abandon his Reason, to bid adieu to Revelation, and stop his ears against the Voïce of Heaven, purely for the sake of Unintelligible Non-sense. Let any thing but the crasty impudence of a *Romish* Priest expose so hard a penny-worth as this to sale, and he may count the Stars of Heaven, the Sands of the Sea-shore, and the minutes of Eternity quite over, before he get a Chapman.

This is the first thing, Christ is our Passeeover: but then *secondly*, we are to keep the Feast in memory of this Passeeover with the Unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth.

It is *Grotius* his observation out of *Servius, Flamines Farinam fermentatam contingere non licebat, nimirum*, sayes he, ἀζυμα significationem habent puritatis & animi submissi; which is a very good reason and is sufficiently confirmed by Testimony of Scripture: from whence it plainly appears, that Leaven was anciently looked upon as a Symbol of every thing which was bad, but more especially of Pride, which is a certain Leaven or puff-past of the mind; and the contrary to this, that is, Unleavened bread, was a Symbol of every thing which was good and virtuous, but more especially of Humility and Sincerity of mind. Thus you see in the Words of my Text, we are bid to keep the Feast not with the Old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the Unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth.

Thus our Saviour forewarned his Disciples to Beware of the leaven of the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*, *Matth. 16. 6.* which in the twelfth verse is expounded of their doctrines; and the reason why false doctrines are called by the name of Leaven, is because they are naturally corruptive of the mind, and fill it commonly as full of Pride as Error, neither is there any man for the most part so positive, so seemingly infallible, so full of arrogance and self-conceit, so great an admirer of himself and his own sect or party, and so great a despiser of all other men besides, as he that labours under a religious mistake, he that consecrates error  
by

by making it an Article of his Creed, and upholds; by the strength of Impudence and the strength of a strange kind of obstinate Faith, the discriminative non-sence of a party which cannot be defended by the strength of Reason.

But if a false doctrine, which is commonly no more than a mistake in the greatest part of them that embrace it, though it may be, and is usually Knavery in their Teachers; if this be called by the name of Leaven, then certainly a bad life and a vicious practice ought much more to be branded with this hateful name: From whence it is, that in the Twelfth Chapter of S. Lukes Gospel, at the first Verse, our Saviour bids his disciples *beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is Hypocrisie*; and in this very Chapter from whence the Text is taken, Fornication, Pride, Idolatry, Covetousness, Extortion, and in a word, every thing almost that is but bad, are manifestly compared to Leaven; and it is of all these as well as of that glorying which is not good, that the Apostle says, *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are, unleavened.*

He speaks chiefly of one of the Church of Corinth, who had taken to himself his Fathers wife, and consequently was guilty of such Fornication, as was not so much as to be named amongst the Gentiles, for fear of giving occasion of scandal to the Gospel of Christ: He exhorts them with great earnestness to deliver such an one unto Satan, to the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; and the reason he gives, why he would have this done, is taken from the necessity of it, *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*, that is, a wicked man in a Party or Society is the same thing as Leaven in the kneaded lump, they both communicate their own bad qualities to the whole masse; and the whole Society is in equal danger of being infected by the pernicious example of a bad man, as the whole lump of being seasoned by a small quantity of leaven.

Wherefore

Wherefore leaven has a double symbolical meaning. First, it is a symbol of spreading and propagation: Secondly, it is a symbol of wickedness, and of every naughty habit of the mind.

In the first respect, the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the miraculously strange propagation of the Gospel of Christ, notwithstanding all the opposition of its professed enemies is likened to Leaven, and a grain of Mustardseed by our Saviour himself; and upon account of both these respects taken together it was, that Leaven was in all kind of sacrifices whatsoever forbidden, *Levit. 2. 11.* no meat-offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall be made with Leaven; for ye shall burn no Leaven nor any Hony in any offering of the Lord made by fire; and offering a sacrifice of thanksgiving with Leaven is mentioned by the Prophet *Amos* as one of the highest instances of the Jewish abominations.

*Matth. 13.  
31, 32, 33.  
Mark 4.  
31, 32.  
Luke 13.  
28. ad 21.*

*See also  
Exod. 24.  
25. & Le-  
vit. 6. 17.*

*Amos 4. 5.*

Ye shall burn no Leaven nor any Hony in any offering of the Lord made by fire; what was the reason of this? why, the reason is plain, because the fire would agitate and provoke the fermenting nature of the Leaven and Hony, and by that means render them more effectual symbols of those bad habits and qualifications of mind, which the Jews by this prohibition were symbolically commanded to avoid.

*Let us keep the Feast with the unleavened bread of Sincerity and Truth.*

From these words we may observe these three things. First, it is manifest that this was a real Feast, and therefore could not be kept with Metaphors and Allegories; now the only thing here mentioned with which we are to keep it, is unleavened bread, which was as has been shown, a symbol of Sincerity and Truth: so that to keep the Feast after this manner, was in effect to enter upon new resolutions of a Holy and Virtuous life.

Secondly, This Feast is the Feast of Christ our Passover, therefore there is no doubt at all, but there is here

a plain allusion made to that unleavened bread, which was made use of at the solemnity of the Passeeover and other Sacrifices; but this bread was not the very Paschal Lamb which was offered up for sacrifice, and to which it was annexed; therefore neither is this bread the same thing in its self, or by any means changed into it, with that sacrifice of Christ, by which he offered up himself for the sins of men; who though he neither did nor could suffer above once, yet is he virtually offered up by the merits and efficacy of his Passion, every time we come to the participation of this Holy mystery, behaving our selves in it like reverent and worthy partakers.

Lastly, How is this the unleavened bread of Sincerity and Truth, if it be no bread at all, but a perfect cheat in the shape and appearance of it? Does not that Religion, think you, give good encouragement to all manner of fraud and Imposture, whose very basis and foundation is laid upon so great a juggle as this? or what obligation can there be to believe and practice that doctrine, which does so manifestly destroy its self, by taking away all safe appeal to our senses, and consequently invalidating and disannulling the evidence of all those miracles upon which its own authority is founded?

Thus I have in general considered the words; I will be somewhat more particular, if you please, and I will begin again with the first particular, *Christ is our Passeeover*. It is with respect to this that Isaac, who was a type of Christ is prophetically called a Lamb, though the business of the Paschal Lamb were not then known in the world, Gen. 22. 7, 8. *And Isaac spake unto Abraham his Father, and he said, my Father, and he said, here am I my Son: and he said, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the Lamb for a burnt-offering? and he said, my son, God will provide himself a Lamb for a burnt-offering; meaning his son Isaac, whom he was about to sacrifice.*

1 Pet. 1.  
18, 19.

S. Peter also tells us, *that we are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot; alluding*

alluding to that place in the Twelfth of Exodus, *Your Lamb shall be without blemish*, verse 5.

In the fifty third of *Isaiah*, at the seventh verse, it is said of the Messias, *that he was brought as a Lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers was dumb*: and in the Eighth of the *Acts*, at the thirty second verse, the place is inverted, *He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearers*.

In the Thirteenth of the *Revelations*, at the Eighth, with allusion to this Paschal Feast, he is called, *the lamb slain from the foundation of the world*: and in the 19. Chapter, at the Ninth verse, we find mention of the marriage supper of the lamb; by which marriage supper, in that place, is immediately understood, the final completion and consummation of the happiness of Saints in Heaven, by being perfectly freed and exempted from all the miseries of humane life, and brought to a complete enjoyment of God and Christ in his glorified estate; but it has also a respect to that marriage supper which is to be celebrated in this life; that is, the due and worthy participation of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; for Christ even with respect to the Church in this life, is called the *Bridegroom*; and every particular disciple is a child of the Bed-chamber, and the Church in the general considered is his Spouse.

*Matth. 9.  
15, &c.*

Now a man would think in all reason, where there is a Bridegroom and a Spouse, there must also be a wedding and a marriage Feast; and accordingly we find both of these in the 22. Chapter of *S. Matthews Gospel*, and in the 14. of *S. Luke*, where the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the gracious offers of blessedness and immortality by the Gospel, is likened to a certain King, which made a marriage for his son, at the solemnity of which marriage a Feast is made, to which many rich and noble guests, such as were most suitable to the splendor of a Kingly entertainment are invited, but they refusing to come, that is in truth; for this is at the bottom of the parable, being

*Verse 2.*

*Verse 16.*

prejudiced against the Gospel, by reason of the seeming meannells of the first promulger of it, and of its manifest contrariety to their worldly designs and Interests: what was at first intended for magnificence is afterwards converted into charity; and he sends his servants into the streets of the City, to call in the poor and the maimed, the halt and the blind, by which is signified the mean and seemingly contemptible condition of the first Disciples and Apostles of Christianity.

Now as this marriage of the Kings son is really nothing else, but the conversion of *Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian*, bond and free to the faith of Christ, and their admittance into the Church by Baptism; so the marriage Feast, or the more especial solemnities of this marriage, together with that union of the Spouse to her Husband, which is consequent thereupon, are no where better set forth than in the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; which is a thankful commemoration of that Passion, by which this marriage is finally consummated, and by which the children of adoption, who are born under it, and engrafted by the merits of it into that body of which Christ is the head, are made heirs of grace and partakers of Eternal life.

So that this Feast in *S. Luke* differs only in degree from that in the *Revelation*, the presence of Christ by his Grace and Spirit, by the merits of his Passion, and the power of his Intercession, to every worthy Communicant at this blessed Table, being only a pledge or earnest of those joys unspeakable, and pleasures at the right hand of God, where Christ himself is in the other World. And this is all that can be understood to be included in the true notion of the Sacrament; It is first a grateful commemoration of the sufferings of God for the sins of men, which cannot possibly be unattended with sorrow for sin, and resolutions of a new life; neither can it when it is hearty and sincere, be unassisted by the gracious encouragements of the Holy Spirit.

It



It is Secondly a pledge or earnest of our future happiness with the Saints in Heaven.

The first Notion of the Sacrament has been sufficiently proved already, our Saviour himself, if we will believe him, (and certainly he knew best what was his own meaning.) tells us plainly that he instituted this Sacrament, *εἰς τὴν ἐμνήν αὐτοῦ*, for a remembrance of himself; and

St. Paul likewise tells us, that as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do shew forth the Lord's death till he come. *Luk. 22. 19. 1 Cor. 11. 24. 25. 1b. ver. 26.*

The second also has the very same Authority to vouch it, *Matth. 26. 29. I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινόν*, when I drink it new with you, that is, when I drink it after a more excellent manner than you do now, when I enjoy that Happiness, that Infinite, complete, and entire satisfaction, undisturbed by any of the miseries or incumbrances of humane life, of which this banquet is but a Type and figure. *Τὸν οἶνον βοτάν, says Grotius, Latitiam*

*immortalem quæ per vinum adumbrata intelligebatur*, so we read of the New Jerusalem in the Book of the Revelation, which St. Paul calls the Jerusalem which is above, that is, the Spiritual Jerusalem of which the earthly City was a figure.

Thus we find mention also of a New Song, that is a most excellent, pleasant, and delightful song, an exquisite composition of some very famed and celebrated master.

*Praise the Lord with the Harp, sing unto him with the Psalter, and an Instrument of ten strings: Sing unto him a new song, play skilfully with a loud noise.*

*Rev. 3. 12. Gal. 4. 26.*

*Psal. 33 3.*

*See also Rev. 5. 9. & 14. 3.*

In the second of the Revelation at the 17th. we read of a new name, to him that overcometh, saith the Spirit to the Churches, I will give to eat of the hidden Manna, that is, the new, the spiritual Manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it. What was this new name which the Spirit would bestow upon him that overcometh?

cometh? why in the 34 Chapter at the 12th verse, it seems to be explained, *I will make him a pillar in the Temple of my God, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the City of my God, which is New Jerusalem which cometh down out of Heaven from my God, that is, I will make him an inhabitant of the New Jerusalem, an inheritor of Eternal life, I will bring him to the infinitely pleasant and delightful enjoyment of the Beatifical Vision in Heaven, and he shall be a Pillar in the Temple of my God and shall go no more out, that is, his happiness shall be as durable as it is exceeding great, and all this I will do because I will write my new name upon him, that is, I will set a mark upon him, by which he shall be known to be mine, he shall appear sprinkled with my Blood, adorned with my Merits, clothed with my Righteousness, and shall lay a just Title to the Promises of my Gospel, after having performed the conditions of it, which is the true sense of overcoming.*

And this New name of Christ is by the Author to the  
 Chap. 1. 4. *Hebrews called a more excellent Name, and all that is meant by it is, the transcendent happiness and glory of Jesus Christ far beyond the most excellent ranks and orders of Created Beings, who being the brightness of his Father's Glory and the express Image of his person, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High, being made so much better than the Angels as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be to him a Father and he shall be to me a son, &c. In fine, to conclude this matter, we are told likewise of a New and better Covenant, a New Commandment, and a New Doctrine, all which may well enough comport with this Interpretation.*

Verse 3. *himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High, being made so much better than the Angels as he*  
 Verse 4. *hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be to him a*  
 Verse 5. *Father and he shall be to me a son, &c. In fine, to conclude this matter, we are told likewise of a New and better Covenant, a New Commandment, and a New Doctrine, all which may well enough comport with this Interpretation.*

And now from all this it may be pretty plain, that the true sense of that place, *I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's*



ther's Kingdom, is as much as if he had said, I have now done with Types and Shadows and am hastening to the full and compleat enjoyment of the substance its self, to the actual possession of that happiness of which this Wine is but a Symbol: which notion however true in its self if it will not pass upon the credit of this exposition, there are other places of Scripture which may be produced to help it out; In the 22<sup>d</sup>. Chapter of St. Lukes Gospel at the 15<sup>th</sup> verse, our Saviour tells his Disciples, *with desire have I desired to eat this Pasche with you before I suffer, For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God,* and again in the 18<sup>th</sup> verse, *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come;* the sense of both which places is certainly the same, I will neither eat this Pasche nor drink this Wine any more, but am now leaving mortality and things below, and am hastening to the possession of that glory, which I had with the Father before the world was, that Feast of Eternal joy and comfort, of which this Pasche is a Type and shadow; I am now preparing for my solemn Inauguration and investiture in that spiritual dominion, which I, as the King of Saints and Sovereign of Angels and Judge of all the world, am to exercise over all created Beings, from the time of my Ascension and for ever, and so the πληρωμα, the αναπληρωσι, the fulfilling of the Pasche, and of the Wine in St. Luke, will be the same with the καινισμος, the ανακαινισις the renovation of them in St. Matthew, and the Analogy between these two the Earthly and the Heavenly Feast is sufficiently manifest from the 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> verses of that Chapter of St. Luke, which I have just now cited, where immediately after the Institution and Celebration of the Lords Supper, our Saviour plainly alluding to that Feast, with which they had been just now entertaining one another, thus bespeaks his Disciples: *I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.*

Again,

Again, as these Feasts had a plain allusion, respect and relation to one another, so the qualifications of the Guests are in both Cases the same, only that the degree of those Qualifications in the Marriage of the Lamb, is much more high and intensive than in that of the King's son, for the Lamb's wife in the 8th verse of the 19th Chapter of the Revelation, *was to be arrayed in fine linnen, clean and white,* which fine linnen, saith the voice there speaking, *is the righteousness of saints,* that is, no man must expect to be partaker of the Heavenly inheritance, who hath not wrought out his own Salvation with Fear and Trembling, not every one who puts in a lazy claim to the Merits and satisfaction of Christ, by an unactive Faith, a Faith without an inward and vital principle of goodness, a Faith without good works, but they who by patience and perseverance in well-doing, by an effectual conquest of all their lusts and passions to the obedience of God and Christ, so far forth as humane nature is capable, and by an unfeigned repentance for what by humane frailty they have done amiss, are made partakers of the benefits of Christs Sufferings, by having fulfilled the Conditions of his Gospel.

So likewise in the other Marriage in St. Matthew, it is *Ch. 22. 11.* said, that *when the King came in to see his guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment*; and that indeed was no great wonder, nor any such hainous fault, if you take the words in the literal sense: for it was not to be expected, that the poor and the lame, the halt and the blind should come all furnished with their wedding garments. Wherefore the meaning is, he did not come rightly prepared to the Participation of this Holy Table. There is indeed one main difference between the Marriage Feast of the Lamb, and that of the King's Son, and that is this, that of the first it is said, *Rev. 19. 9.* *blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb*; but of the latter, *Matth. 22.* *many are called but few are chosen.*

14.

The reason of which difference is to be taken from the different

different perfection of the Feasts themselves; the one being only a pledge or earnest, an imperfect taste and relish of our future happiness, which may be afterwards forfeited by sin, or at that very instant become forfeit, by the lazy indifference and indisposition, by the ingratitude and unthankfulness; or by the filth and impurity, the naughtiness and uncleanness of a mans mind and will at the participation of this holy Feast; but the other is the full and final and irreverfible enjoyment of it.

To which purpose it is likewise, that to the marriage of the Kings son, the good and bad are equally admitted; *Matth. 22. 10. So those servants went out into the high ways, and gathered together all, as many as they found, both bad and good; and the wedding was furnished with guests.*

The reason is, because it is naturally impossible in this life in very many cases, to distinguish the Saint from the Hypocrite, a due preparation from an imperfect, a sincere from a pretended and counterfeit repentance; and he that does presume to approach this Holy Table, without that awful preparation which becomes it, he does it at his own peril, and must expect to hear of it another day.

But in the marriage of the Lamb; that is, in the other world, in that state which is not the trial of virtue, but the reward of it; none will be admitted but such as are in some sence or other perfect; such as have at least a conditional and Evangelical, though not an absolute and legal righteousness, a perfection of true Faith and of sincere Repentance, though not of universal and unfinning obedience; such as have maintained a sharp conflict with their lusts and passions, though they have not perfectly conquered and subdued them; but to the rest it will be said, as it was to him who had not on his wedding garment; *Friend, how camest thou hither, not having on thy wedding garment, bind him hand and foot, take him away, and cast*

*Matth.  
22. 12, 13.*

*him into utter darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*

Joh. 1. 29.

To make an end of this comparison of Christ to the Paschal Lamb, it is in allusion to this that *John seeing Jesus coming unto him, saith, Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world*; as the Paschal Lambs by redeeming the first-born, may be said to have taken away the sins of the *Israelites*: for by taking away sins, nothing else is meant, but remitting that punishment which was due to them; otherwise a sin being once committed, it is impossible it should ever be uncommitted again, and so cannot be said to be taken away in any other sense but this, and this the Paschal Lamb did by the Divine appointment; the *Israelites* being otherwise as obnoxious to this or any other punishment, as the *Egyptians* themselves were; though not for the very same sins for which *Pharaoh* and his subjects were, yet for sin in general, which no man but is more or less guilty of, and which is enough to stand in need of a redemption.

And truly he that shall consider their repinings in the Wilderness, and their murmurings in the Desert, their disobedience to God and his servant *Moses*, their relapses to Idolatry both in the Wilderness and after; their want of an entire system of a law in *Egypt* to be the rule of their lives, and the perfect measure of their behaviour either towards God or Man: lastly, whoever shall reflect upon their gross ignorance, in matters of a more speculative and refined nature; their utter unsuitness for all such Philosophical considerations, as are the best preservatives against Idolatry, will not think otherwise, but that they had some tang of it from their converse in *Egypt*; especially considering that by such compliances as these, some of their hard Taskmasters might be rendred less cruel to them; perhaps their hankering so vehemently after the Garlick and Onions in *Egypt* may well enough bear something of this sense; for we know very well what veneration such trifles met with in those parts.

*Porum & cape nefas violare & frangere morsu,  
O sanctas gentes quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis  
Numina* —

Now

Now if it be true that the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ the Saviour and redeemer of mankind; if it be likewise true, that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is the marriage-Feast of the Lamb, or somewhat more imperfectly, the marriage-Feast of the Kings son, that is, of Christ to his Church; there being nothing, which either does or ought more closely to unite us to him, than the observation of this blessed Banquet; then is it plain, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are not Transubstantiated, either by any Priestly charms, or by any Divine power, into the very body and bloud of Christ himself; otherwise the Bridegroom and his marriage-Feast will be the same, and his guests instead of congratulating with him, upon so happy an occasion, will but devour him and eat him up, playing the perfect Cannibals with their friend and benefactor, which, as I take it, is an improper way of congratulation.

Again, in the third Chapter of the *Revelations*, at the 20. verse, it is said, *Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me:* Now in the first place it cannot be denied, that these words have reference to the Church militant, that is, to the Church of God on this side Heaven. For first, it appears from the 14. verse of this Chapter, that these words were spoken to the Angel of the Church of *Laodicea*, which is also alike clear all the way from the 14. verse to the 19. and in that verse it is said, which is my second proof; *As many as I love I rebuke and chasten, be zealous therefore and repent:* now they who are blessed in a future state, are past all manner of rebuke and chastisement, and they need no repentance; no more do the damned neither for any good it will do them; for their repentance is but one part of their misery, therefore it would be fruitless to exhort either of them to it, which the Amen, that is, Christ in this place manifestly doth. I might urge a third and a fourth Argument from the 21. and 22. verses of this Chap-

fer, but this is enough; for which reason I will omit these and proceed to the second observable in the words, which is the thing I aim at, and that is this; *If any man hear the voice and open the door*; that is, if he have a mind fitly qualified and prepared to give a due reception and entertainment to the Spirit of God and Christ; if he do not wilfully harden himself and shut him out, *Christ will come in unto him and will sup with him*; that is, he will at all times be sufficiently present to him by the grace and assistance of his good Spirit, to encourage him in well doing; to strengthen him in temptations, and comfort him in and under afflictions, and will at last bring him to glory by the merits of his Passion, and the powerful interest of his Intercession: It is impossible, it cannot be denied that this is the very sense, Christ cannot be said to sup with us in any other sense but this; it is likewise impossible and absurd to deny, that Christ in this sense does sup with every true Believer at the receiving of the Sacrament; but he cannot both sup with us, and also be that very meat on which we feed our selves; therefore I conclude that the Elements of Bread and Wine in this holy solemnity are not changed into the Body and Bloud of Christ.

And if it be objected, that this is only a figurative way of speaking, and so nothing can be inferred from it; I grant indeed that it is a figure, but then it is such a strange figure as was never heard of before, that our fellow-boarder, our fellow-commoner should be taken for our diet; it would be worth travelling a great way to see such another figure.

Again, *I will come in unto him, and will sup with him, and be with me*. Let it be granted for once, that by the Pronoun [I] in this place, is meant not the spiritual, but the personal and corporeal presence of Christ, by the feat of Transubstantiation; and one of these must be allowed, unless they will deny, that Christ does as really sup with, that is, is as much present to Believers at the receiving of the Sacrament, as upon other occasions. What will be



the consequence of this? The Bread and Wine thus transubstantiated into the Body and Bloud of Christ, is not only the spiritual, but the material and literal food of Believers; they do really and truly eat his Body and drink his Bloud; so then, *I will come and sup with you*, that is, my Body and Bloud will come and sup with you, is as much as to say they will feed upon themselves; for these are the two things that make the entertainment. Lastly, since we are told, *That we being many, are one Bread and one Body: for we are all partakers of that one Bread*; it will follow, if we take these words literally, that the whole Church by being partakers of that one Bread, are transubstantiated into that one Bread, which is that one Body, which is Christ; and so at this rate the Church and the two Elements of Bread and Wine, and Christ himself will be all one and the same thing; namely, a certain strange kind of unintelligible Banquet left all alone to feed and solace its self upon its self; and this is wonderful pretty indeed; this is a figure too, but 'tis a new one, and wants a name; therefore you may call it a *Romanism*, if you please; and I wish no Protestant may ever use it.

1 Cor. 10.  
17.

Thus I have proved in general, I could do it much more particularly if the time would permit; or if there were any doubt of it amongst Christians, that Christ is our Passeeover, and shown what are the consequences of that proposition. The Jews themselves confess, that the Passeeover was a Type of the Messias as well as we, though they will not allow our Jesus to be that Messias; and accordingly they tell us fine stories of the deliverance of their Nation by him, upon that very day on which the Passeeover was instituted, being some time or other to happen on the Anniversary of their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage; and this, if they had known what kind of deliverance that was which they were to expect, together with the rest of mankind, had been right enough; for it is on all hands agreed, they themselves have not the impudence to deny it, that our blessed Lord suffered

suffered upon the Croſs at this very time; but this was not that deliverance from Temporal bondage, and from the Roman power, which they with ſo much earneſtneſs expected, although it be manifeſt at firſt ſight that the Paſchal Lamb could be no Type of the *Meſſias*, if they had been to be delivered by any other way, than that of his Suffering and being put to death for their ſakes. For this reaſon they have ſome of them employed their thoughts in finding out objections why our Jeſus could not be Typified by the Paſſeover under the Law: I will propoſe their objections, as high as I am able in their own words, and answer them with ſuch fairneſs, that they ſhall have no reaſon to complain of ſoul play.

The firſt objection which you may ſee with the reſt that follow in the Notes of *Munſter*, upon the 26th of *St. Mattheu* is this; If the Lamb of the Paſſeover be a Type of the ſuſpended, or the accuſed, that is in their language, of Chriſt, it would be neceſſary that there ſhould be many new Chriſts and new Jeſus's born into the world one after another for ever, becauſe of the multitude of Paſchal Lambs, and the annual repetition of that Sacrifice according to the Law amongſt the *Jews*.

This Objection is answered by a Chriſtian in the ſame place, who brings theſe difficulties only to reſolve them, and I have ſome reaſon to believe it may be *Munſter* himſelf, thus: That this may as well be that all the Paſchal Sacrifices might be a joynt Symbol of that one Sacrifice of Chriſt, as that ſuch an infinite number of Rainbowes ſucceeding one another through all times and ages, ſhould be a concurrent and joynt Seal of that one Covenant, which God had entred into with man that he would not drown the world any more.

I ſhall not diſpute the validity of this answer, but the ſcruple will admit of ſeveral other ſolutions beſides this: as firſt, That that ſolemn Feaſt which was, or was to be Celebrated every year by the nation of the *Jews*, was not, to ſpeak properly, the true Paſſeover it ſelf, but only a com-  
memo-



memoration of it. Secondly, That they may as well say, that none other of the *Jewish* Sacrifices were Types of Christ, though most certainly they were, because of their often, nay indeed, much more frequent repetition than that of the Paschever. And then Thirdly, that we are to make an infinite distinction betwixt the Bloud of brute animals and the Bloud of God, neither was it possible that one, nay, that one hundred thousand such Sacrifices an hundred thousand times told, could worthily Typifie and represent so great an Attonement.

A second Objection is this, *Your Lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year, Exod. 12. 5.* whereas Jesus at his Crucifixion was three and thirty. To which the Christian answers excellently well, That the Lambs being but a year old, was to Typifie the Innocence of Christ who was as free from all sin as a child of a year old, or under: for the place is not so to be understood as if the Lamb were precisely to be a year old neither more nor less, but only that it was not to exceed that age; and therefore, as I remember, the opinion of the *Jewish* Masters in this case is, that every Lamb being furnished with those other qualifications above mentioned, that is, being a male and without blemish, is fit for this purpose all the time from a moneth to a year old; and it is certain that in all other Sacrifices such as were either in whole or in part to be consumed by fire upon the Altar, as this was not, only the bloud was sprinkled by the Priests, and Fat, cawl and kidneys, were indeed burnt upon the Altar, (these two things being essential to all Sacrifices in general, insomuch that even in the sin & trespass offerings, which by reason of their pollution were burnt without the Camp, or else after much legal purification eaten by the Priests, yet in these very offerings themselves the fat, cawl, and kidneys were consumed upon the Altar) I say in all other Sacrifices whatsoever, as in the sin offering, the Trespass offering, the Burnt offering, and the Peace offering of all kinds, the rule was this, *Lev. 22. 27, it shall be seven days under the*

dans;

*Lev. 7. 2, 3, 4, 7, 23, 25. See also Dr. Cudworth in his Treatise of the Sacrament ad Outrant de Sacrifice c. 11. p. 47.*

dam; and from the eighth and thenceforth, it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And that this rule was extended to the Peace offering wherein the Priest and they by whom it was offered were to have their share, so as God and they did in a manner all of them feed together at one common table, as well as in other Sacrifices wherein either the Priest or people or both had no share; is manifest from *verse 29.* of the same Chapter, where *Moses* immediately speaks of the Sacrifice of Thanksgiving which was one sort of Peace-offering, as if what had been said before had given occasion to it. And when, saith he, ye will offer a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving unto the Lord, offer it at your own will.

His third Objection or rather cavil is this. That our Saviour was Crucified, that is, put to death by being nailed to the Cross, whereas the Paschal Lamb was to be killed by cutting its throat, as animals killed for food use to be. But to this it is there answered and proved out of Scripture, That the words *Shachal* and *Tabach* made use of in the Hebrew to denote the killing of the Paschever, may sometimes be taken in a larger signification; which evasion of his is also sufficiently justified by that place of the Author to the Hebrews, where he compares the suffering of Christ in general without the gate, to the burning of the sin-offering without the Camp; which place will likewise furnish me with another answer, and that is, That Christ was not only a Paschever but also a sin-offering, and so was to dye an accursed death, and this punishment being to be inflicted by the Roman Authority, the burning of his body being more honourable and in better esteem among them, would not have answered to the sin-offering's being burnt without the gate, but the best representation of it was Crucifixion which was the most servile and ignominious punishment in use among them, and also by the Jews themselves, who cryed so loudly *σταυρωθητω, σταυρωθητω, let him be crucified, let him be crucified*, accounted and taken for such. Wherefore this Objector betrayes himself extremely

*Heb. 13. 11.*  
12.

*Math. 27.*  
22, 23.

creamily when he tells us that whereas the Paschal Lamb was to be killed as the *Hebrew* phrase imports between the two Evenings, yet Jesus Christ must needs have suffered in the morning, *Chi col dinei lisrael ella beboker*, because all the punishments inflicted by the *Jews* were inflicted in the morning.

*Been ba-  
harbaim.  
Exod. 12.6*

For besides that this exception it self is a manifest confession that he suffered some time or other of that day on which the Paschever was to be killed, and not to mention that he forgets the History of those times, by which it is plain that the power of life and death was for several years before in the hands of the *Romans*; It is further clear that our Saviour was nailed to the Cross at the third hour, that is, at Nine in the morning, though it is true indeed that he did not give up the Ghost till the ninth hour, that is, till three or between three and four in the afternoon, and that is just, *been habarbaim*, between the two evenings, being about the middle space betwixt the meridian and setting-sun, which was the very time when the Paschever ought to be killed according to the Law of *Moses*.

However, let it be how it will, when the same thing is Typified and shadowed out by several Types, it is impossible it should exactly answer them all; for that were to suppose the Types themselves to be all of them the same: otherwise it is absurd to expect when they differ from one another, that the Antitype should exactly correspond with them all.

To maintain the similitude between the Paschal Lamb and the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, it is enough to say, That as the destroying Angel spared the first-born of the *Israelites* upon seeing the blood of the Paschever sprinkled upon the posts and lintels of their several houses; so God for the sake of Christ will pass over us, and will not impute sin to us, whereever he sees the blood, that is, the Meritorious passion of his Son rightly applied by a hearty belief of the Gospel, and by a conversation answerable to it, and that as this preservation of the First-born by the blood

E

of

of the Paschal Lamb, while the *Egyptians* had nothing but the voice of mourning and lamentation in their streets, was the last miracle wrought in the behalf of his people while they continued in *Egypt*, accompanied with the last plague inflicted on the *Egyptians*, bating their being drowned and finally destroyed in the red Sea ( which red sea was likewise a Type of the blood of Christ, by which they who are not saved by making a right use of it, will be more effectually and inexcusably condemned for having abused so great a mercy ) so the shedding of the Blood of Christ upon the Cross is the last deliverance, the last Atonement which God will afford his people ; it will likewise in the end prove the last plague of those, who have not duly applyed it to themselves, but living in a perpetual opposition to the Laws of God, and the doctrine of the Gospel, have slighted all the gracious offers of pardon and forgiveness, and wilfully neglected so great Salvation.

And as the same red sea gave a safe and secure passage to the *Israelites*, but executed the utmost of its rage and fury upon *Pharaoh* and all the Host of the *Egyptians*, so will the blood of Christ give a safe and comfortable passage to all his hearty followers and disciples into the joys of Heaven, while it will but serve more effectually to overwhelm and ruine the unbelieving world.

Again as that first Passeeover of the destroying Angel, passing by the habitations of the *Israelites* did but prepare the way for the second Passeeover, that is, the passage of the *Israelites* through the red sea and wilderness, into the land of *Canaan* ; so God's passing over us, that is, his pardoning and forgiving our sins, and not imputing them to as many of us, as heartily believe and obey the Gospel, does but prepare the way through the wilderness and red sea, all the troubles and difficulties of this life, into the land of *Canaan*, that is, if we do not repine and murmur, if we do not disbelieve his Word, distrust his Providence, and disobey his Laws, as the *Israelites* did, into the complete and entire possession of Eternal happiness, of which the land of *Canaan* was a Type.

Far-

Farther, as the Paschal Lambs which the Jews fed upon for ever after, neither were nor could be the same with those which were killed by the respective families, the evening before the great deliverance of the first born, but only a memorial, a commemoration of them; so neither is that Eucharistical Feast, which we celebrate in the Christian Church, a Feast upon the Body of Christ himself, but only a memorial of our deliverance in, by, and through him, and a Sanction of that Covenant, which he hath purchased for us by his blood.

Lastly, as it was unlawful either to eat or drink the blood of the Paschal Lamb; so also it must needs be unlawful for us either to eat or drink the blood of Christ, for contraries cannot possibly be Types of contraries, the blood of the Paschal Lamb cannot possibly be a Type of the blood of Christ, if it be unlawful for us to feed upon the one, and necessary to drink the other.

And this is enough to make out the resemblance between the Paschal Lamb and Christ, and to shew that one was a Type of the other: he that will have more than this, before he will admit it to be a Type, does not understand the nature of Types and Parables and Symbols, nay not so much as of Metaphors in common discourse, in which there is required no more than only some plain agreement in one or more particulars, without any gross repugnancy or inconsistency in any.

But Jesus was at the same time our Paschal Lamb and our sin-offering too, wherefore being to fulfil two such different representations of himself under the Law, it is not much to be wondered, if the similitude do not hit in all points.

By being our Paschal Lamb he takes away the punishment of our sins, which God passeth over and will not impute them to us; by being our sin-offering he takes away the guilt of them too, to as many as are sanctified by Faith in his blood, as the sin-offering under the Law

did, by the guilty persons laying their hands upon it, truly and properly receive that guilt, which was to be expiated by this way of atonement; which by the way, may be sufficient to shew us, how bad Interpreters the Socinians are of the New Testament, and how little they understand the nature of our Saviour's Sacrifice for sin, when they deny him to have made a true and proper satisfaction to the justice of God for it; for there can be no resemblance between him and the sin-offering, but only in this particular; for this reason it is, that he is said to have born our sins in his own body on the tree, to have been a Ransom for us, to have been made sin for us who knew no sin, and the like; and from hence it was that Jesus, *that he might sanctifie the people with his own Blood, suffered without the gate,* as the sin-offering under the Law was to do without the Camp, by reason of its uncleanness, being polluted with the sins of those on whose behalf it was offered, as the same inspired writer likewise takes notice in the same place, *for the bodies, saith he, of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest for sin, are burnt without the Camp:* upon which account it was, that if the blood of these Sacrifices were brought into the Tabernacle to make reconciliation withal, it was unlawful not only for God himself, (for that he never did in the sin & trespass-offering,) but even for the Priests or any body else to partake of them: to which the same Author in the same place manifestly alludes, and brings the comparison home to the Sacrifice of Christ, *We have an Altar, saith he, whereof they have no right to eat that serve the Tabernacle, for the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the Priest for sin, are burnt without the Camp, wherefore Jesus also that he might sanctifie the people with his own blood suffered without the gate:* now it being unlawful for the people in all cases and for the priest himself in this, to partake of the sin-offering, and Christ being our sin-offering, and having sanctified the people with his own blood,

*Heb. 13. 12*

*Heb. 13. 11*

*Heb. 13.  
21, 12.*



bloud; it is manifest that it must needs be unlawful for us to partake of this Sacrifice, in that sence which the Papists would have; that is, we must not truly and properly eat his Body; and so those words, *This is my Body*, must not be understood in the literal sence, much less must we imagine, that God will work miracles to contradict himself and his Apostles, and destroy the nature of those Types, by which the Sacrifice of his Son was signified under the Law.

But yet, notwithstanding this, nothing hinders, but that we may celebrate an Eucharistical or a Mnemoneutical feast in both of these respects, as well because he is our sin-offering, as upon account of his being our Passeeover; for by both of these taken together, our deliverance from the jaws of Death and Hell is completed, and we are delivered from the bondage of corruption, from the intolerable servitude of sin and Satan, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God; a deliverance of so high a nature, that though we had not been commanded to commemorate it by our Saviour himself, who with his own bloud purchased it for us, yet mere gratitude and good nature, nay, common honesty and common sence themselves would have prompted all hearty Christians not to sit down contented with a bare narrative, a cold story of such a redemption; but they would certainly have found out some symbols, the better to represent it, as much as may be, to our outward senses, and fix it deeper in our minds, according to that saying,

*Segnius irritant animas demissa per aures,*

*Quàm quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus --*

And there could not possibly better symbols have been found out, than those of eating Bread and drinking Wine, by which both the manner of our Lords Passion, by the rending of his Body and the spilling of his Bloud is signified; and the union of the Church by the participation of

that

the same Table, which was always accounted a symbol of the strictest friendship, and which was another end of this holy Feast, was intended to be inviolably maintained and preserved.

And thus the feeding upon the Paschal Lamb under the law, is more than answered, by our spiritual feeding upon the Body of Christ; that is, by our being more than nourished, by our being saved and Eternally made happy by the merit and satisfaction of his Death.

After this the same Objector goes on to raise difficulties, not so much against the resemblance of the Paschal Lamb to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, as against the Sacrament its self, which bears an Analogy with the Paschal Feast; he demands therefore how we can be said to eat the Body and drink the Bloud of Christ in the Sacrament; whether it were, that he cut off pieces of his own Flesh, and gave them to eat, or whether his Body was made up of nothing but Bread and Wine, instead of Flesh and Bloud, animated with a humane Soul; and the matter out of which it was taken, being more than would suffice to make an entire humane Body, whether the remainders of it were not that which he gave to his Disciples, saying, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Bloud*; that is, it is a part of that substance, or it is a substance of the same nature with that of which my Body and Bloud are composed. I am pretty sure I do not wrong the Objector; he that has a mind to be better satisfied, may read him in his own words, in the Notes of *Munster* upon the 26. Chapter of *S. Matthew*; which suppositions of his the more frivolous and impertinent they are, the more clearly do they show, that nothing can be so absurd, which a man let alone to make use of his own faculties, would not rather pitch upon, than this mysterious Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

But he goes on further to object, that Body which the Disciples are said to have eat and drank, whither did it go? did it go through certain private passages of its own?

or



or was it mixt in the stomach and Intestines with the rest of their usual diet? Which I confesse against the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* would be no very weak or impertinent objection: for upon supposition that the Elements of Bread and Wine are really and substantially changed into the Body and Bloud of Christ, which cannot now be distinguished from his glorified Body, (it being the same Body which was once crucified and is now glorified) one of these Four things must of necessity follow: Either we do not really receive it in the Sacrament, but only seem to do it; and so there is a double cheat put upon our senses; or else it passes out, by some hidden and peculiar passages of its own; or else the person of Christ is really united to the person of every Communicant; which union is as often multiplied as we receive the Sacrament; a thing not only absurd, but blasphemous to suppose; or else lastly, which I abhor to think, it is as he expresses it, *Mehouraf bekeebah him shear haachel*, and passes out by the *infamis ductus* into the common *slime* and *saburra* of the world.

The wit of man cannot think of a fifth thing I am sure; whereas all this is easily taken off by saying, that the true Elements taken in the Lords Supper, are only a remembrance of his meritorious Death and Passion, and of that blessed Feast of Happiness and Joy, which all good Christians will partake with him in the world to come. *Whither God of his infinite mercy bring us all, by the merits and mediation of the same Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with the Father and the blessed Spirit be ascribed, as is most due, all honour, glory and praise, from this time forward and forevermore. Amen.*

THE END.